

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated August 16, 2006. Claims 1-29 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-29 and objected to claims 1-10. In this Amendment, claims 1, 10, and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-29 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-10 were objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to correct for the informalities. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 1 and 9 render claims 1-10 compliant with all formality requirements, and therefore request that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

§103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5, 10, 12, 14, 16-21, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski (US 6,201,538) in view of Lemmons et al. (US 2003/0051243).

Claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski in view of Lemmons as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Donnelly (US 2002/0199192).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski in view of Lemmons as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Arai et al. (US 2004/0221307).

Claims 7, 8, 13 22, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski in view of Lemmons as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Hendricks et al. (US 5,990,927).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Donnelly and Hendricks [sic] as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Suzuki (US 5,790,170).

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski in view of Lemmons as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Suzuki and Cuccia (US 6,337,719).

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski in view of Lemmons as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Ellis (US 6,820,278).

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai in view of Wugofski and Lemmons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 10 and 29) are patentable over Wugofski, Lemmons, Donnelly, Arai, Hendricks, Suzuki, Cuccia and Ellis.

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward the transmission and reception of "program guide information." Each of the claims recites that "the program guide information [is] generated by comparing program guide information received from a broadcast source to program guide information received from a non-broadcast source." Supporting disclosure for Applicants' scheme for generating

program guide information can be found in the specification at, for example, page 9, line 9 to page 12, line 11.

Neither Wugofski, Lemmons, Donnelly, Arai, Hendricks, Suzuki, Cuccia nor Ellis discloses generating program guide information by comparing program guide information received from a broadcast source to program guide information received from a non-broadcast source. Regarding Arai, Applicants note that Arai's program guide information is generated solely on the basis of program guide information received from broadcast sources (see e.g. Arai paragraphs [0019], [0244], and [0245]). Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 1, 10 and 29 are patentable over Wugofski, Lemmons, Donnelly, Arai, Hendricks, Suzuki, Cuccia and Ellis - taken either alone or in combination - on at least this basis.

Each of dependent claims 2-9 and 11-28 depends on either independent claim 1 or independent claim 10. Since dependent claims inherit the limitations of their respective base claims, Applicants believe that claims 2-9 and 11-28 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons discussed in connection with claims 1 and 10.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 654-5000.

Application No.: 09/807,804

Docket No.: SONYAK 3.3-122

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: November 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By



Bruno Polito

Registration No.: 38,580

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

706698_1.DOC